

Key:

Closed :

New:

C-9714

SR 108/US 101 Mason and Thurston Co Fish Barriers - Remove Fish Barriers

RFQ Questions #3

Question	RFQ Reference	Questions	Date Received	Response
1	RFQ Title Page	The RFQ Title Page Shows “Pilot” where the Contract No. should be, though the rest of the pages show in the footer, “20210525 V12SVB Mod”. Please advise that 20210525 V12SVB Mod is the correct contract number.	8/23/2021	The items you describe are relevant to the WSDOT RFQ template version that was used as the basis for the document. These numbers are not related in any way to the contract number (C-9714).
2	General	Per our conversation on Thursday, 8/19, please advise if shortlisted teams for other DB Projects that have yet to be awarded, including US 101 Jefferson & Clallam, will be allowed to list some of the same key personnel. This has been a non-issue in the past, as shortlisted only leaves a 33% chance of winning the project and precluding those key personnel will leave out highly qualified people to be listed on this project. If not allowed to list shortlisted personnel from other DB pursuits, please make it known to all submitters. If it will be allowed, please advise.	8/23/2021	The required Key Personnel assignment commitments to this project are described in RFQ section 7.5. Key Personnel may be proposed for this RFQ that are also included on Proposal teams for other projects currently in procurement (including US 101, Jefferson & Clallam Co.) In the event that your team is selected as the Design-Builder for the “other” project, the Key Personnel proposed for that project are committed to that project as described in RFQ section 7.5. At that time, you would need to submit proposed replacement Key Personnel for this project as described in RFQ section 5.4. Those proposed replacement Key Personnel would be subject to an equal or better determination by WSDOT as described in RFQ section 5.4. If the proposed Key Personnel replacements are determined by WSDOT to not be equal or better your Proposal would likely be deemed non-responsive and disqualified. This substitution process must be completed prior to the Proposal Due date for this project.
3	Table 7.2 (Pg 16-18)	Table 7.2 (Pg 16-18): Will the evaluation be broken down by sub-goal, as was done on US 101 Jefferson & Clallam? Or by the overall goal? The evaluation criteria is not clear on this and affects how the SOQ is presented to WSDOT.	8/23/2021	Goals are defined in Section 4.3. Unless otherwise specified, evaluation of a goal will include all applicable sub-goals.
4	Appendix A, Form E	Regarding Form E, can Submitters re-create Form E in our own template to better edit and add information as long as all information requested is provided in the same format? If this is not permissible, will WSDOT provide the Form in Word format to better accommodate the required information?	9/2/2021	A Microsoft Word version of Form E will be available on the Project website as noted in Addendum #2.
5	Section 7.3	Would WSDOT consider allowing Arial as an acceptable font, similar to how the US 101 Jefferson and Clallam RFQ allowed per addendum 2?	9/13/2021	Arial font is allowable as noted in Addendum #2.
6	Table 7.2, SOQ Organization and Scoring	On page 16, Table 7.2 identfys a maximum of 8 pages for Key Personnel (Section 2). Section 7.5 identifies five required Key Personnel to be addressed within these 8 pages. Three of the Key Personnel are evaluated against all three goals, one is evaluated against two goals, and the last is evaluated against one goal as identified in Section 4.3, which have combined total of 8 sub-goals. In light of these requirements, please consider increasing the page limit to 12 pages for Key Personnel (which amounts to one page per goal for each person, and recognizing that each goal has multiple sub-goals, so anything less than one page per goal is not feasible).	9/13/2021	See Addendum #3 for clarification on sub-goals.

Question	RFQ Reference	Questions	Date Received	Response
7	Table 7.2, SOQ Organization and Scoring	On page 17, Table 7.2 identifies a maximum of 8 pages for Major Participants (Section 3). Section 7.6 identifies four categories of Major Participant that need to be addressed within these 8 pages. With up to seven potential major participant firms. In light of the number of different firms that must potentially submit narratives, and that three of the four categories must respond to 2-3 of the goals, please consider increasing the page limit to 10 pages for Major Participants.	9/13/2021	The page limit for Major Participants will remain at 8 pages.
8	Section 4.3	Please further define the “multiple barrier replacements” portion of Goal 3a “Public agency projects with multiple barrier replacements are preferred.” Would daylight in between a series of structures count as multiple barriers?	9/14/2021	A barrier is an existing condition that restricts the movement of fish. Multiple structures on the same stream would be multiple barrier replacements.
9	Table 7.2	Please confirm the Construction Manager must respond to each sub-goal for Goals 1, 2, and 3. On WSDOT’s recent US 101 RFQ an addenda was issued that removed sub-goals 1B and 3A. Will this RFQ be amended to remove those sub-goals as well?	9/14/2021	See Addendum #3 for clarification on sub-goals.
10	Addendum #2 Section 7.3	Addendum #2 states that Arial font is acceptable for use in proposals. Does that include Arial Narrow or is it limited to Arial?	9/17/2021	The two allowable font types per Addendum #2 are Times New Roman and Arial.